

# The augment in Homer, with special attention to speech introductions and conclusions

Filip De Decker (LMU München)

---

## Abstract\*

*In this article, we will show that the use of the augment in Homeric speech introductions and conclusions was not random, but could be explained by morphometric, syntactic and semantic constraints. Later, these rules were no longer understood: the augment became a mandatory marker of past tense in Greek prose, while its absence in Homer (which was also motivated by rules and constraints) was reinterpreted as an archaism and an element of the poetic language. The article only focuses on Homeric speech introductions and conclusions, and leaves out a discussion of Homer and epic poetry in general, of Mycenaean and the other Indo-European languages that have the augment.<sup>1</sup>*

---

## 1 Introduction

The augment was originally an accented deictic particle *\*h<sub>1</sub>é* ‘then, in that case’,<sup>2</sup> and was not mandatory in Indo-European verbal morphology. In Greek and in several other Indo-European languages, it evolved into a prefix *e-* that could be added to past tense forms of the indicative (imperfect, aorist and pluperfect). In the oldest Greek prose texts, Mycenaean (13<sup>th</sup> century BC), it was almost always absent,<sup>3</sup> while in Homer unaugmented verbal forms were more common than augmented ones.<sup>4</sup> In Classical Greek, however, it had become the

---

\* Special thanks go to Olav Hackstein, Peter-Arnold Mumm and Dieter Gunkel (LMU München) for sharing their thoughts in a detailed discussion on the augment. We also would like to thank Dieter Gunkel, Ivo Hajnal (Innsbruck) and Sonja Zeman (LMU München) for observations they made during the discussion of this paper.

<sup>1</sup> The augment has been treated extensively and was even debated among Alexandrian scholars. Studies of the Homeric augment have been made by Grashof (1852), Poehlmann (1858), Koch (1868), La Roche (1867: 76-80 and 99-102; 1882), Platt (1891), Drewitt (1912a, 1912b and 1913), Shewan (1912 and 1914, in response to Drewitt), Beck (1919), Chantraine (1948: 479-484), Bottin (1969), Blumenthal (1974), West (1989), Basset (1989), Strunk (1994), Bakker (1999a and 2005), Mumm (2004), Lehnert (2005, an analysis of the augmentation in the first two books of the *Iliad* based on Mumm (2004) and with a short overview of previous scholarship on pages 1-8; unfortunately, he neglected all the other explanations; and 2012, a very brief discussion), Willi (2005), Pagniello (2007), Hackstein (2011b: 32 f.) and García-Ramón (2012).

The most detailed analysis of verbal forms in compounds is Dottin (1894), but we were unable to consult it ourselves (it was quoted in Chantraine 1948 and Bottin 1969).

For a thorough analysis of previous scholars (especially from the 19<sup>th</sup> century), one can consult Bottin (1969). As Bakker (2005: 115) pointed out, Bottin (1969) is the only thorough overview of scholarship from 1850 until 1969. The only aspect that he did not discuss, was Franz Bopp’s theories on the origin of the augment: Bopp explained the augment either as a negative suffix denying the present state or as a shorter form of the emphatic particle *ê*. This was repeated by Bréal (1900). For an analysis of Bopp’s theories, see Strunk (1994).

<sup>2</sup> I follow here the analyses by Bopp (1833, quoted in Strunk 1994), Bréal (1900) and Strunk (1994), who stated that the augment was related to the emphatic particle *ê* (see previous note).

<sup>3</sup> For the absence in Mycenaean, see Vilborg (1960: 104), Hooker (1980: 62) and Bartoněk (2003: 337). The only certain augmented form is *a pe do ke* ‘he gave away’, but Luria (1960) interpreted it as *apesdoke* and in that case, that form would have been unaugmented as well (we personally find that explanation rather unlikely in light of the double preverb). The augment in Mycenaean has been treated by Hoenigswald (1964), Mumm (2004), Ruijgh (2011, edited posthumously) and García-Ramón (2012), but in-depth analysis of the augment in Mycenaean cannot be performed here.

<sup>4</sup> Koch (1868: 27), Platt (1891: 229 f., doubting the accuracy of Koch’s figures), Monro (1891: 402), Drewitt (1912a: 44-47 and 1912b), Chantraine (1948: 484, also doubting Koch’s figures), Basset (1989), Bakker (1997b: 52, noting that Koch’s observations were intrinsically right, and 2005: 115).

mandatory marker of past tense with forms in the indicative, while the absence of the augment was reinterpreted in later poetry as an archaism or *Homerism*.<sup>5</sup> An example of an augmented form is:

- (1) ἔ-παιδεύ-ε-τε  
*e-paideú-e-te*  
 ‘you educated. IMPF 2 PL.’

The only observation that has been made on the use of the augment in speech introductions, is that they are more often augmented than not.<sup>6</sup>

Table 1: Augmented verb forms in speech introductions and conclusions<sup>7</sup>

	Speech introductions	Speech conclusions
Augmented	1055	438
Unaugmented	277	231
Totals	1332	669

Speech conclusions have not been discussed in the literature so far. In what follows, we will address the augment use from a morphometric, syntactic and semantic point of view.

## 2 Morphometric observations on the augment use

a) The most important observation is that the augment is always used or left out if the opposite would render the form unfit for the verse.<sup>8</sup> This does not mean that the augment use was solely motivated by the metre, because in many instances, both augmented and unaugmented forms would have fitted the metre. An example of an introduction in which only an unaugmented form could be used, is:

- (2) ὃ σφιν ἐὺ φρονέων ἀγορήσατο καὶ μετέειπε  
*hó =sphin eù phronéo:n agoré:sato kaì metéeiπε*  
 he them.DAT being well-intended speak in the assembly. AOR 3SG and ↓  
 speak (to a large group).AOR 3SG

‘He spoke in the assembly and addressed them with good intentions’ (*Iliad* 1,73).

b) Older forms, such as duals and root aorists, usually remain unaugmented,<sup>9</sup> while younger forms, such as the sigmatic aorist and the medio-passive aorist in *the:*, are more often augmented.<sup>10</sup> This is an archaism from the period, when the augment was not yet mandatory.<sup>11</sup> An example from a speech conclusion is:

- (3) ὥς τώ γε κλαίοντε προσαυδήτην βασιλῆα  
*hò:s tó:=ge klaíonte prosaudé:te:n basilê(w)a*  
 so the two weeping the two spoke. IMPF 3 DU king.ACC  
 ‘and so the two of them spoke tearfully to the king’ (*Iliad* 11,136).

<sup>5</sup> The Alexandrian scholar Aristarkhos (3<sup>rd</sup> – 2<sup>nd</sup> century BC) already considered a non-augmented form to be *poie:tikó:teron* ‘more poetic’ but did not remove all the augmented forms from the text; for an analysis of his criteria to accept or deny the existence of an augment, see Schmidt (1854a and 1854b).

<sup>6</sup> Bakker (2005: 126 f.); Drewitt (1912a: 44) had already implicitly stated that speech introductions were more often augmented than not.

<sup>7</sup> The figures are based on Fingerle (1939: 308-342 and 349-355).

<sup>8</sup> As Peter-Arnold Mumm points out to us, the augment is thus never used against the metre.

<sup>9</sup> As Peter-Arnold Mumm points out to us, this means that the dual somehow excluded the use of the augment and that the dual ceased to be productive before the augment became grammaticalised.

<sup>10</sup> Blumenthal (1974), but his study was criticised because the corpus was deemed too limited. See Bottin (1969: 92-96) for a list of all dual forms.

<sup>11</sup> We leave out the discussion of whether the absence of the augment was a feature of the Indo-European *Dichtersprache*, as Delbrück (1879: 68) and Wackernagel (1942: 1-4) argued, or that the absence was due to the fact that PIE in general did not have the augment yet.

c) The augment is always used when the form without it would yield a short open monosyllabic verb form (*horror monosyllabi*).<sup>12</sup> This explains the difference in augmentation between the following two sentences:

- (4) Αἰγισθος δολόμητις, ἐπεὶ κτάνε πολλὸν ἀρείω.  
*Aígisthos dolómé:tis, epeì ktáne pollòn areío:*  
 Aigisthos.NOM deceitful.NOM since kill.AOR 3SG much.ADV someone better.ACC  
 ‘deceit-minded Aigisthos, since he had killed someone far superior’ (*Odyssey* 3,250).

- (5) Αἰγισθὸν δολόμητιν, ὃς οἱ πατέρα κλυτὸν ἔκτα  
*Aígisthon dolóme:tin, hós =hoi patéra klutòn ékta*  
 Aigisthos.ACC deceitful.ACC who.NOM SG him.DAT father.ACC famous.ACC kill.AOR 3SG  
 ‘deceit-minded Aigisthos, who had killed his famous father’ (*Odyssey* 3,308).

This explains why the verb form *ê* ‘s/he spoke’ is always augmented: the non-augmented form *\*h<sub>2</sub>eǵt* would have become *†akt* and eventually Greek *†a*. Such a form would not have survived, and therefore the form had to be augmented:

- (6) ἦ καὶ ἀναΐξας ἐριούνιος ἄρμα καὶ ἵππους  
*ê kai ana:í:ksa:s erioúnios hárma kai híppous*  
 speak.AOR 3SG and jump.AOR PTCP quick running chariot.ACC and horses.ACC  
 ‘he spoke, and the quick running jumped on the chariot and horses’ (*Iliad* 24,442).

This constraint is applied only to *open* monosyllabic verb forms. As such, the following verb was not augmented, because it has a closed syllable:<sup>13</sup>

- (7) ὦς φάν, τῷ δ' ἀσπαστὸν εἰσατο κοιμηθῆναι  
*hò:s phán, tói d' aspastòn eeísato koime:thênai*  
 so speak.IMP 3PL to him lovely it seemed.AOR sleep.INF.AOR  
 ‘so they spoke, and it seemed welcome to him to go to sleep’ (*Odyssey* 7,343).

d) The augment is not used when its use would require the elision of a rare case ending such as the dual in E, the dative singular in I or the dative plural in SI or if a form would become unclear by the elision.<sup>14</sup> The following example is revealing:

- (8) ὦς εἰπὼν Αἴαντε καλέσσατο καὶ Μενέλαον  
*hò:s (w)eipò:n Aíante kaléssato kai Menélaon*  
 so speak.AOR PTCP the two Aiantes.ACC he called out.AOR and Menelaos.ACC  
 ‘So he spoke and called out to both Aiantes and to Menelaos’ (*Iliad* 17,507).

In this instance, the verb form *kaléssato* can only be unaugmented, because the sequence *Aíant' ekaléssato* would be ambiguous, as it could either mean ‘he called Aias’ or ‘he called both Aiantes’. As such, only *Aíante kaléssato* is possible.

e) A last remark is that compound verbs are almost always augmented, even when there are syntactic or semantic constraints against the augment (such as being used in a negative sentence or being followed by a clitic).<sup>15</sup> One example is:

<sup>12</sup> Wackernagel (1906: 147 f. (=1951: 148 f.)), Brugmann (1916: 13), Meillet (1937: 243), Schwyzler (1939: 651), Chantraine (1948: 482), Strunk (1967: 275 and 1987), Szemerényi (1990: 322) and recently also Mumm (2004: §1.1-without reference to Wackernagel). Wackernagel (1906) showed that a similar evolution occurred in Armenian and Middle Indic.

<sup>13</sup> Wackernagel (1906: 147 f. (=1951: 148 f.)), Strunk (1967: 275).

<sup>14</sup> La Roche (1869: 76-82 and 113).

<sup>15</sup> As was stated in footnote 1, the standard work is Dottin (1894), but we were unable to consult the work.

- (9) ὥς φάτο, τὸν δ' οὐ τι προσέφη πολύμητις Ὀδυσσεύς  
*Hò:s pháto, tòn d' ouí ti proséphe: polýme:tis Odysseús*  
 So speak.IMPV 3SG him.ACC not something.ACC address.IMPV 3SG wilyOdysseus.NOM  
 'So he spoke, but wily Odysseus did not address him' (*Odyssey* 20,183).

In this instance, *proséphe:* is a compound and is augmented, although it appeared in a negative sentence (cf. *infra*).

### 3 Syntactic observations

In the next subchapter, we discuss the syntactic constraints that influence the use and absence of the augment.

a) A verb form that is followed by a 2<sup>nd</sup> position clitic<sup>16</sup> is in most cases not augmented.<sup>17</sup> Below are the figures of past-tense verb forms that are followed by a 2<sup>nd</sup> position clitic. There are 1746 past tense forms that are followed by a clitic, and they are distributed as follows:

Table 2: Past tense forms followed by a 2<sup>nd</sup> position clitic

Simplex verb form is followed by a clitic		Compound verb form is followed by a clitic	
1693		53	
Unaugmented	Augmented	Unaugmented	Augmented
1282	411	12	41

An augmented verb form is a compound of an orthotonic particle \**é* and an (in origin enclitic) verb form:

- (10) ἔειπε  
*éeiπε*  
 \**e* = *wek<sup>w</sup>e*  
 's/he spoke'

That an augmented form is a sort of compound, is confirmed by the accentuation in Greek and Vedic.<sup>18</sup> When a Vedic verb is compounded and accented, the accent is always put on the preverb immediately preceding the verb form and never on a preverb preceding another preverb; similarly, the accent is always put on the augment when an augmented form is accented. The Greek accentuation preserves the old compound status as well: although the general rule in Greek verbal accentuation states that the accent should be protracted as far as possible, the accent could never be placed further than the augment, as it could also never be placed further than the last preverb.<sup>19</sup> The following two forms show this:

- (11) παρ-έκ-δος παρ-έ-σχον  
*par-ék-dos par-é-skhon*  
 'give out (as addition)!' 'I provided'

If an enclitic or a word that cannot be put at the beginning of the verse is used in the verse, it has to be put in the second position.<sup>20</sup> As we stated above, the augmented verb form

<sup>16</sup> We use the term '2<sup>nd</sup> position clitic' to indicate those words that cannot be put at the first position in the sentence. They are not all enclitic, and therefore the term clitic or enclitic would be incomplete.

<sup>17</sup> This was first mentioned by Drewitt (1912b: 104) and expanded in Beck (1919). The instances of *dé* were counted in Bottin (1969: 99-105).

<sup>18</sup> Wackernagel (1877: 469 f.), Monro (1891: 77), Meillet (1937: 243). For the accentuation, see Bally (1947: 100) and Probert (2007: 47). For the Vedic accentuation and compounding, see Macdonell (1910: 315).

<sup>19</sup> Meillet (1939: 243), Bally (1947: 100), Probert (2007: 47).

<sup>20</sup> This is based on the observations by Bergaigne (1878: 91-93 for Latin, Greek, Indo-Iranian and Germanic) and Delbrück (1878: 47 f. for Vedic prose) and Wackernagel (1892 for all Indo-European languages known at the time of publication), who stated that enclitic words had to come second in a sentence.

is a compound of an orthotonic particle and an enclitic verb form. If a 2<sup>nd</sup> position clitic followed an augmented verb form, the word order would be the following:

- (12) ἔειπέ τε  
*éipé te*  
 ‘and s/he spoke’  
 \**e*=                    *wek<sup>w</sup>e* =                    *k<sup>w</sup>e*  
 Augment – enclitic verb form - clitic

A sequence enclitic verb followed by a clitic particle violates the clitic chain rules, however. In Greek, the (clitic) coordinating particles are put first in the clitic chain, followed by the other particles, then the pronouns and the verb forms can only appear at the very end of the chain.<sup>21</sup> A sequence augmented verb – clitic would have to be reconstructed as follows:

- (13) \**e* =  $k^w e$  = *wek*<sup>w</sup>*e*  
 Augment – Clitic – Verb form

This sequence is impossible in Greek, because the augment can never be dissolved from the verb in Greek. As such, the verb had to be accentuated and act as the first orthotonic word of the sequence, being followed by the clitic:

- (14) εἶπε            τε  
*eîpe*            *te*  
*\*wék<sup>w</sup>e* = *k<sup>w</sup>e*  
 Verb          Clitic

This explains the absence of the augment in the following instances (verb and clitic are put in bold face):

- (15) μέσσω δ' ἀμφοτέρων σκῆπτρα σχέθον, εἶπέ τε μῦθον  
*mésso:i d' amphotéro:n skêptrá skhéthon, eîpé= te mûthon*  
middle.DAT SG both.GEN PL sceptres.ACC hold.AOR3PL speak.AOR3SG and ↓  
word.ACC

‘They held the sceptre in the middle of both and he spoke a word’ (*Iliad* 7,277).

- (16) ὥς ἔφατ': αἶδετο γὰρ θαλερὸν γάμον ἐξονομῆναι  
*hòs éphat': aídeto = gàr thaleròn gámon eksonomênai*  
 so speak.IMPF 3SG feel shame.IMPF 3SG indeed lustful marriage.ACC mention.INF AOR  
 'So she spoke, and she was ashamed to mention lustful marriage' (*Odyssey* 6,66).

b) A verb form was often not augmented when it was connected with a preceding augmented verb form by the connecting particles *kaí* ‘and’, *te* ‘and’, *háma te* ‘together with’, *te kaí* ‘and’ or *idé* ‘and’. An augmented form is marked and in a series of marked forms only the first one needed to be marked. This is called *conjunction reduction* and was first noticed by Kiparsky (1968).<sup>22</sup> He observed that in Indo-Iranian and Greek in a sequence of marked forms such as augmented indicatives or imperatives, the first form was marked, but the next one(s) were replaced by the injunctive.<sup>23</sup> Starting from the idea that the injunctive was neutral as to time,

<sup>21</sup> For the clitic chain, see *Monro* (1891: 335-338, even before *Wackernagel* had posited his famous Law), *Wackernagel* (1892: 336), *Delbrück* (1900: 51-53 with reference to *Monro*), *Brugmann* (1904: 682 f.), *Krisch* (1990: 73 f.), *Ruijgh* (1990), *Wills* (1993), *Watkins* (1998: 70).

<sup>22</sup> He expanded this in Kiparsky 2005 (discussing Hoffmann 1967), but the basic ideas of 1968 remain the same. We personally believe that 'markedness reduction' might be a better term.

<sup>23</sup> This is not only the case with augmented verb forms, but also occurred in a sequence of dual forms (see Strunk 1975: 234-239, without using the phrase ‘conjunction reduction’; Fritz 2011: 50 f.) or in a sequence of modal forms. For Greek, the injunctive was replaced with the infinitive in the case of a sequence of more than one imperative. Kiparsky (1968: 54 f.) expanded this idea to the Indo-Iranian (and maybe also Indo-European) *vāyav indraś ca* ‘O Vāyu and Indra’ construction, in which the vocative was the marked form and the nominative the

Kiparsky stated that the absence of the augment in these verbal forms was due to ‘conjunction reduction’: the first form was marked and the others were left unmarked and neutral.<sup>24</sup> A sequence

Verb +PAST ... Verb +PAST  
evolved into

Verb +PAST ... Verb –PAST.

Kiparsky’s suggestion offers an explanation for many instances where augmented and non-augmented forms co-occur with hardly any semantic difference visible. This rule explains why the speech conclusions with *ê* ‘s/he spoke’ are followed by a verb that is often not augmented.<sup>25</sup> The 88 speech conclusion formulae with *ê* are always part of a sentence in which other verb forms occur as well, and in 82 instances the connection is made with *kaí* or *háma te*. In 55 instances, the verbal form following *ê* was not augmented.

Examples of this reduction are (the verb forms in question are put in bold font):

- (17) ὥς ἄρ' ἔπειτ' **ἦρᾱτο** καὶ αὐτὴ πάντα **τελεύτα**  
*hò:s ár' épeit' e:râto kaì autè: pánta teleúta:*  
 so then next pray.IMPV 3SG and herself.NOM everything.ACC PL finish.IMPV 3SG  
 ‘so then he prayed, and she completed everything herself’ (*Odyssey* 3,62).
- (18) τοὺς δὲ ἰδὼν νείκεσεν ἔπος τ' **ἔφατ'** ἔκ τ' **ὀνόμαζεν**  
*toùs dè (w)idò:n neíkessen epos = t éphat' ék=t' onómazen*  
 them.ACC see.AOR PCP insult.AOR 3SG word.ACC and speak.IMPV 3SG out and ↓  
 call.IMPV 3SG  
 ‘He saw them, insulted them, spoke a word and called out’ (*Odyssey* 17,215).

Verbs connected with the connecting particle *kaí* are much more often subject to this reduction than forms connected with the connective-adversative *dé* ‘and, but’. Kiparsky tried to explain this by arguing that the augmentation of many verbs was a later regularisation during the transmission.<sup>26</sup> There is another explanation, however. The particle *dé* did not mark a mere transition, but adds new information, while *kaí* connected two (or more) aspects of the same action or event.<sup>27</sup> When *dé* is not used as a simple connective but is contrasting different

---

unmarked one. This combination of vocative and nominative had been noted before, namely by Wackernagel (1878: 280 f.), Delbrück (1879: 28, who stated that the Sanskritist Theodor Benfey was the first to notice this feature, 1888: 105 f.), Haskell (1885: 66), Caland (1890: 544 f.), Monro (1891: 155) and Platt (1909). Platt argued that the rule applied only to *Anreden* linked by *te* but not when the persons addressed were connected by *kaí*. According to Platt this rule applied to Attic prose as well, but not to Pindar (*but the rule seemed too subtle for the Boeotian wit*). Verdenius (1987: 116 f.) flatly denied that this was a rule at all. We believe that the rule cannot be denied, but there is an alternative to the *markedness reduction* possible as well. Schwyzler-Debrunner (1950: 63) assumed that the PIE particle *\*k<sup>w</sup>e* only connected words but not sentences, and therefore considered the use of the nominative to be logical: as the vocative is a sentence on its own, the nominative is not connected but simply an apposition to the vocative (that the apposition to a vocative could be put in the nominative had been noted by Delbrück (1900: 195 f.), to whom Schwyzler-Debrunner referred (with the wrong page number 396 instead of 196)). For a detailed study of this address formula see Zwolanek (1970, we owe this reference to Peter-Arnold Mumm). She argued, following Caland (1890: 544 f.), that the case following the vocative was determined by the function of the syntagma in the sentence: if the function of the addressees was subject in the sentence, the first element was put in the vocative and the other(s) in the nominative; when they were object, the first one was put in the vocative and the others in the case (dative or accusative) they had in the sentence. Especially Avestan showed many instances of this construction.

<sup>24</sup> Kiparsky (1968: 36).

<sup>25</sup> Peter-Arnold Mumm (personal communication) was more sceptical: if the augment in *ê* had become the norm, the speakers might not have felt it as augmented form anymore and consequently, it might not have been triggered the reduction anymore.

<sup>26</sup> Kiparsky (1968: 41 f.); Rosén (1973) tried to do the same.

<sup>27</sup> Klein (1992), Bakker (1997b: 62-82), Hajnal (2003b: 227 f.).

actions, the verb forms connected by it are not subject to the *markedness reduction*;<sup>28</sup> when *dé* connects actions that are closely linked, the verbs linked are subject to the reduction. One example is:

- (19) ἦ καὶ ἀναΐξας ἐριούνιος ἄρμα καὶ ἵππους  
 ê kaì ana:í:ksa:s erioúnios hárma kaì híppous  
 he spoke.AOR and having jumped.AOR quick running chariot.ACC and horses.ACC  
 ‘he spoke, and the quick running (Apollo) jumped on the chariot and horses’  
 καρπαλίμως μάλιστα καὶ ἡνία λάζετο χερσίν,  
 karpalímo:s mástiga kaì hé:nia ládzeto khersín  
 quickly whip.ACC and reins.acc he took.IMPF with his hands  
 ‘quickly he grasped the whip and reins with his hands’  
 ἐν δ’ ἔπνευσ’ ἵπποισι καὶ ἡμιόνους μένος ἦύ.  
 en d’ épneus’ híppoisi kaì he:miónois ménos e:ú.  
 into he blew.AOR horses.DAT and mules.DAT strength.ACC good.ACC  
 ‘and blew strong force into his horses and mules’ (*Iliad* 24,442-444).

In this instance, Homer described how Apollo finished speaking, jumped on his chariot and took the reins in his hand. He then proceeded to incite his mules and horses. This is a surprising action as gods did not usually incite their horses. As such, this new action was not merely connected to the previous one, but was contrasted with it: the first verb *ê* was augmented, but *ládzeto* was not, because it was connected to *ê* by *kaí*. The verb form *épneuse* added new information and was therefore augmented.

c) The verse initial position of the verb usually leads to the absence of the augment.<sup>29</sup> As the *Verberststellung* is a very marked position for the verb,<sup>30</sup> there is less for an additional verbal marker. The majority of these non-augmented instances of a verse initial verb form could also be explained by the fact that the verb forms are followed by a 2<sup>nd</sup> position clitic, but this solution does not apply to all of them. Metrical reasons cannot be excluded, but are not the only explanation, as forms such as *égno*: ‘he knew’ and *éste*: ‘he stood’ could be used at the beginning of the verse.

- (20) εἶπεν ἐπευξάμενος Δίτ τ’ ἄλλοισίν τε θεοῖσι<sup>31</sup>  
 eîpen epeuksámenos Dií = t’ álloisín = te theoîsi  
 he spoke.AOR pray.AOR PTCP Zeus.DAT and other.DAT PL and gods.DAT  
 ‘he spoke, praying (loudly) to Zeus and the other gods’ (*Iliad* 6,475).
- (21) θρήνεον· ἐνθα κεν οὐ τιν’ ἀδάκρυτόν γ’ ἐνόησας  
 thré:neon éntha = ken oú = tin’ adákrytón = g’ enóe:sas  
 they wailed.IMPF there MP not someone.ACC not cried for.ACC notice.AOR 2SG  
 ‘they wailed, and there you could not have seen anyone not crying’ (*Odyssey* 24,61).

<sup>28</sup> Bakker (1997b: 52 and 2005: 116) who nevertheless doubted the existence of *conjunction reduction*. This was also pointed out by our colleague Dr. Dieter Gunkel (LMU München, personal communication during the discussion after the presentation).

<sup>29</sup> Chantraine (1948: 482), Bertrand (2006a), De Lamberterie (2007: 37, 56 f.). Van Thiel (1991: xxvi) pointed out that this had been observed already by the Byzantine scholars.

<sup>30</sup> That the verb final position was default, had been noticed before by Bergaigne (1879), Delbrück (1878: 17 and 1888: 17), Kühner-Gerth (1904: 595), Watkins (1963: 48, 1998: 68), Fortson (2010: 142-144), Fritz (2010: 384). The idea that the verb final position is the unmarked one and the initial one is marked goes back to Delbrück (1878: 17-19). It was expanded to the languages discovered after his (Delbrück’s) death by Dressler (1969). For PIE in general, see Watkins (1963: 48), Fortson (2010: 142-144), Fritz (2010: 384), and for Hittite see also Luraghi (1990: 88 f. and 110-117) and Bauer (2011).

<sup>31</sup> In this verse the variant *eípe d’* was suggested by Aristarkhos and was preferred by Kirk (1990: 223), but Van Thiel and West printed *eîpen*. The absence of the augment in both readings can be syntactically explained.

## 4 Semantic observations

a) Although there is no agreement on a special meaning of the augment and although most scholars assume it to be randomly used,<sup>32</sup> the semantic explanation of the augment can be summarised as follows: the augment is *a deictic suffix that marked the completion of the action in the presence of the speaker*,<sup>33</sup> and puts the past action into the foreground.<sup>34</sup> More specifically, it is used:

- more often in speeches than in narrative,<sup>35</sup>
- to describe a past action is valid for or linked to the present situation,<sup>36</sup>
- to mark the transition from narration into direct speech,<sup>37</sup>
- to stress new information.<sup>38</sup>

b) Past tense forms used in speech introductions with an addressee have the augment.

The tables for the simplex verbs are the following:

Table 3: (Aimplex) past tense forms of *verba dicendi* with an addressee

Verb	Augmented with person addressed	Unaugmented with person addressed	Augmented without person addressed	Unaugmented without person addressed	Total instances
<i>agoreúo:</i>	None	4	None	4	8
<i>ameíḃomai</i>	78	9	1	1	99
<i>audáo:</i>	72	None	13	2	87
<i>phe:mí</i>	1	1	43	13	58
<i>pho:néo:</i>	None	None	None	34	34
Totals	151	14	57	46	286

<sup>32</sup> Curtius (1873: 134 f.) stated „*das Fehlen des syllabischen Augments bei Homer ist vollkommen facultativ (...) aber sie* (sc. the use and absence of the augment, FDD) *auf bestimmte Regeln zurückzuführen ist kaum möglich*“ (underlining is mine). Delbrück (1879: 68, note 1) stated „*Die Versuchen einen* (sc. a difference in meaning between augmented and non augmented forms, FDD) *zu finden scheinen mir misslungen zu sein.*“ See also Meyer (1896: 561) „*bei Homer ist das Fehlen des syllabischen Augments vollständig facultativ; Gesetze hierüber lassen sich schwerlich finden.*“ See also Allen (1917: vi f.), Hoffmann (1970: 36 f.), Untermann (1987: 31 f.), Beckwith (1996: 1-3), West (1998: xxvi f.), Sánchez Ruipérez (1999: 39), Wachter (2000: 97 f.).

<sup>33</sup> Bakker (2005: 147); this had already been observed by Platt (1891: 227, almost with the same words).

<sup>34</sup> Mumm (2004), Bakker (1999a: 59 and 2005: 123 f.), Hackstein (2010a: 405).

<sup>35</sup> Koch (1868), Platt (1891: 223), Drewitt (1912a), West (1989), Basset (1989: 15) used the term *situation de discours*; Bakker (2005: 114-153).

<sup>36</sup> Platt (1891), Drewitt (1912a, 1912b and 1913), Basset (1989), Bakker (1997 and 2005), Mumm (2004).

<sup>37</sup> Drewitt (1912a: 44), Bakker (1995: 126 f.). It is noteworthy that the deictic pronouns almost exclusively occur in speeches, see Bakker (1999b) and De Jong (2012). As pointed out by Peter-Arnold Mumm (p.c.), the transition from narrative to direct speech involves a *Verlebendigung* and the audience is drawn into the dialogue itself.

<sup>38</sup> Mumm (2004), Lehnert (2005 and 2012).



The tables for the compounds are the following:

Table 4: (Compound) past tense forms of *verba dicendi* with an addressee

Verb	Augmented with person addressed	Unaugmented with person addressed	Augmented without person addressed	Unaugmented without person addressed	Total instances
<i>proséeipon</i>	185	None	3	None	188
<i>metéeipon</i>	55	None	10	None	65
<i>prósphe:mi</i>	224	None	10	None	234
<i>metáphe:mi</i>	14	None	None	None	14
<i>prospho:néo:</i>	35	None	1	None	36
<i>metapho:néo:</i>	5	None	3	None	8
<i>prosaudáo:</i>	138	2 (in a conclusion)	42	None	182
<i>metaudáo:</i>	23	None	2	None	25
Totals	679	2	71	None	752

An example of an introduction with an addressee is (addressee and verb are put in bold face):

- (22) **τὴν δ'** **ἡμείβετ'** ἔπειτα πατὴρ ἀνδρῶν τε θεῶν τε  
**Tè:n d'** **e:meíbet'** *épeita pate:r andrón = te theôn = te*  
 Her.ACC he answered.IMPF then father.NOM men.GEN PL and gods.GEN and  
 'Then the father of humans and gods answered her' (*Iliad* 1, 544).

Speech introductions without addressee or introductions for a soliloquy remain unaugmented. The instances of verbs with a soliloquy, are (w)eípe *pros hòn megalé:tora thu:món* 'he spoke to his own strong spirit' (11 instances)<sup>39</sup> and *proti (w)òn mu:thé:sato thu:món* 'he spoke to his own mind' (4 instances).<sup>40</sup> An example is:

- (23) ὀχθήσας δ' ἄρα εἶπε πρὸς ὃν μεγαλήτορα θυμόν  
*okhthé:sa:s d'ára (w)eípe pròs hòn megalé:tora thu:món*  
 become angry.AOR PTCP indeed he spoke.AOR towards his strong minded spirit.ACC  
 'Angry, he spoke towards his own strong spirit' (occurring 11 times).

c) The speech conclusions with *phe:mi* 'I speak' have the augment, when they are expanded with a participle because the participle adds new information about the manner of speaking. There are 44 instances of such an extension,<sup>41</sup> and in 31 cases the verbal form is augmented.<sup>42</sup>

- (24) ὥς ἔφατ' εὐχόμενος, τοῦ δ' ἔκλυε Πάλλας Ἀθήνη  
*hò:s éphat' eukhómenos tou d' éklye Pallàs Athé:ne:*  
 so he spoke.IMPF praying him.GEN hear.IMPF 3SG Pallas Athena.NOM  
 'so he spoke praying, and Pallas Athena heard him' (*Odyssey* 3,385).

<sup>39</sup> The instances are *Iliad* 11,403; 17,90; 18,5; 20,343; 21,53; 21,552; 22,98 and *Odyssey* 5,298; 5,355; 5,407 and 5,464.

<sup>40</sup> The instances are *Iliad* 17,200; 17,442 and *Odyssey* 5,285; 5,376.

<sup>41</sup> The instances are *Iliad* 1,43; 1,357; 1,457; 5,106; 5,121; 6,311; 8,198; 10,295; 11,592; 12,442; 15,337; 16,46; 16,249; 16,527; 19,301; 19,338; 20,364; 20,373; 20,393; 21,161; 21,361; 22,429; 22,437; 22,515; 23,184; 23,771; 24,314; 24,746; 24,760; 24,776 and *Odyssey* 2,80; 2,267; 3,385; 6,328; 9,413; 9,536; 16,448; 20,22; 20,102; 22,210; 23,181 and 24,438.

<sup>42</sup> The instances are *Iliad* 1,43; 1,457; 5,106; 5,121; 6,311; 8,198; 10,295; 11,592; 15,337; 16,249; 16,527; 19,301; 19,338; 20,393; 22,429; 22,437; 22,515; 23,771; 24,314; 24,746; 24,760; 24,776 and *Odyssey* 2,267; 3,385; 6,328; 9,413; 9,536; 20,22; 20,102 and 23,181.

d) The speech conclusions with *phe:mí* were augmented when the speaking influenced a large audience or provoked a reaction of the addressee. In 194 verses, the subject of the next sentence differs in number from the speech conclusion with *phe:mí*. In 176 instances, the form of *phe:mí* is augmented, and in 18 instances it is not.<sup>43</sup>

Table 5: Change in person number between the verb of the speech conclusion with *phe:mí* and that of the next sentence

Change in person number (first the conclusion, then the number of the next sentence)	Total instances	The form of <i>phe:mí</i> is augmented	The form of <i>phe:mí</i> is not augmented
1 <sup>st</sup> p. sg. versus 3 <sup>rd</sup> p.sg.	36	36	None
1 <sup>st</sup> p. sg. versus 3 <sup>rd</sup> p. pl.	4	4	None
3 <sup>rd</sup> p. sg. versus 1 <sup>st</sup> p. sg.	20	18	2
3 <sup>rd</sup> p. sg. versus 3 <sup>rd</sup> p. pl.	114	103	11
3 <sup>rd</sup> p. pl. versus 1 <sup>st</sup> p. sg.	2	2	None
3 <sup>rd</sup> p. pl. versus 3 <sup>rd</sup> p. sg.	18	13	5
Totals	194	176	18

The change in subject number indicates a contrast between the person(s) who spoke and the person(s) addressed. Such a contrast is found in dialogues and in reactions to speeches in an assembly.

- (25) ὡς ἔφαθ', οἱ δ' ἄρα τοῦ μάλα μὲν κλύον ἥδ' ἐπίθοντο  
*hò:s éphath', hoì d'ára toû mála mèn klúon e:d' epíthonto*  
 so he spoke.IMPF they then him.GEN very PTCL hear.IMPF 3PL and obey.AOR 3 PL  
 'So he spoke, they listened attentively to him and obeyed him' (used seven times).<sup>44</sup>

e) The speech conclusions combined with *ára* 'indeed' are mostly augmented.

Table 6: Speech conclusions with *ára*

Verb	Augmented conclusion	Unaugmented conclusion
<i>éiPON</i>	None	<i>hò:s ára tis (w)éípesken</i> is attested 6 times <sup>45</sup>
<i>ê</i>	<i>ê rha</i> is attested 51 times	None
<i>phe:mí</i>	<i>hò:s ár'éphan</i> is attested 9 times <sup>46</sup> , <i>hò:s ár' éphe:</i> is attested 18 times <sup>47</sup>	None
<i>pho:néo:</i>	<i>hò:s ár' ephó:ne:sen</i> is attested 9 times <sup>48</sup>	None
Totals	87	6

<sup>43</sup> The instances are *Iliad* 2,278; 12,442; 20,373; 21,114; 21,284; 23,184 and 23,287 and *Odyssey* 2,337; 4,703; 7,434; 10,321; 11,97; 12,192; 21,366; 22,68; 23,205 and 24,345.

<sup>44</sup> The instances are *Iliad* 7,379; 9,79; 14,133; 14,378; 15,300; 23,54; 23,738.

<sup>45</sup> The instances are *Iliad* 4,85; 17,423; 22,375 and *Odyssey* 4,772; 13,170; 23,152.

<sup>46</sup> The instances are *Iliad* 3,161; 3,324; 7,181; 7,206 and *Odyssey* 9,413; 17,488; 18,75; 18,117 and 21,404.

<sup>47</sup> The instances are *Iliad* 1,584; 5,111; 5,607; 21,136; 21,502 and *Odyssey* 2,377; 8,482; 17,409; 17,462; 18,185; 19,361; 19,386; 19,503; 20,120; 22,433; 22,465; 23,181 and 24,397.

<sup>48</sup> The instances are *Iliad* 10,465; 19,276 and *Odyssey* 2,257; 10,229; 17,57; 19,29; 21,163; 21,386 and 22,398.

The particle *ára* creates a contrast between what was said before and the action following the speaking.<sup>49</sup> This contrast explains the use of the augment.

- (26) ὦς ἄρ' ἐφώνησεν, λῦσεν δ' ἀγορὴν αἰψηρήν  
 hò:s ár' ephó:ne:sen, lúsen d' agorèn aipse:ré:n  
 so indeed he spoke.AOR he loosened.AOR assembly.ACC quick.ACC  
 'So indeed he spoke, and he immediately broke up the assembly' (*Iliad* 19,276).
- (27) ὦς ἄρ' ἔφη, ποταμὸς δὲ χολώσατο κηρόθι μᾶλλον  
 hò:s ár' éphe:, potamòs dè kholó:sato ke:róthi mállon  
 so indeed speak.IMPF 3SG river.NOM but become angry.AOR 3SG in his heart very  
 'So indeed he spoke, but the river became very angry in his heart' (*Iliad* 21,136).

f) As the augment stresses new information, it is used with the following words, indicating an immediate or unexpected action: *aĩpsa* 'suddenly, quickly'; *autíka* 'immediately'; *nûn* 'now'.

Table 7: augmented verb forms and *aĩpsa*

Augmented	Unaugmented	Total
64	45	109

Table 8: Augmented forms and *autíka*

Augmented	Unaugmented	Total
92	42	134

Table 9: Augmented forms and *nûn*

Tense	Augmented	Unaugmented
Aorist <sup>50</sup>	87	45
Imperfect	11	6
Pluperfect	2	2
Totals	100	53

An example of a speech introduction is:

- (28) αἶψα δ' Ἀθηναίην ἔπεα πτερόεντα προσηύδα  
 aĩpsa d' Athe:naíe:n (w)épea pteróenta prose:úda:  
 suddenly PTCL to Athena.ACC words.ACC winged.ACC PL he spoke.IMPF  
 'Suddenly, he spoke winged words to Athena' (*Iliad* 8,351).

g) The augment is absent in negative clauses because the negation removes the link with the actual situation (the negation and the verb form have been put in bold face):<sup>51</sup>

- (29) ἦτοι Ἀθηναίη ἀκέων ἦν οὐδέ τι εἶπε  
 é:toi Athe:naíe: akéo:n ên oudé ti (w)eĩpe  
 Indeed Athene.NOM unwilling.NOM be. IMPF 3SG and not something say.AOR 3SG  
 'Indeed, Athene was (very) unwilling and did not say anything' (*Iliad* 4,22).
- (30) ὦς ἔφατ', οὐδέ Διὸς πεῖθε φρένα ταῦτ' ἀγορεύων  
 Hò:s éphat', oudè Diòs peĩthe phréna taút' agoreúo:n  
 So speak.IMPF 3SG and not of Zeus he persuaded.IMPF mind.ACC that.ACC PL speaking  
 'So he spoke, but he did not persuade Zeus' mind saying those words' (*Iliad* 12,173).

<sup>49</sup> Hartung (1832: 422), Stadelmann (1840: 131), Mutzbauer (1909: 149), Fingerle (1939: 362), Denniston (1959: 38), Grimm (1962: 24), Chantraine (1968-1974: 100), Bakker (1993a: 18-22 and 2005: 98), Latacz (2000: 179).

<sup>50</sup> In Attic, the aorist is also very common with *nûn*, see Rijksbaron (2002: 29).

<sup>51</sup> Bakker (1997a: 56, 64 and 2005: 126-130), Mumm (2004: §5.4), De Lamberterie (2007: 51).

h) Unaugmented forms are preferred in clauses that are introduced by *epeí* ‘since, after’ and *êmos* ‘when, after’,<sup>52</sup> as these clauses belong to narrative parts, actions in a more remote past and descriptions of background actions. The figures are:

Table 10: Augmented forms and *epeí*

Augmented	Unaugmented
224	290

Table 11: Augmented forms and *êmos*

Augmented	Unaugmented
12	24

An example is:

- (31) ὥς φάτο, βῆ δ' ἄρ' ὄνειρος ἐπεὶ τὸν μῦθον ἄκουσε  
*hò:s pháto bê d'ár' óneiros epeì tòn mûthon ákouse*  
 so speak.IMPF 3SG go.AOR 3SG then dream.NOM since the word.ACC hear.AOR 3SG  
 ‘So he spoke, the dream then departed, since it had heard the word’ (*Iliad* 2,16).

i) The augment is missing when repeated actions are described, because such descriptions do not add new information. As such, the augment is mostly missing with the word *aiei* ‘always’.

Table 12: Augmented forms and *aiei*

Unaugmented	Augmented	Total
41	15	56

An example is:

- (32) αἰεὶ δὲ σμερνὸν βοόων Δαναοῖσι κέλευε  
*aiei dè smerdnòn boóo:n Danaoîsi kéleue*  
 always terrible.ADV shout.PRES PTCP Danaans.DAT he ordered.IMPF  
 ‘He continuously incited the Danaans, shouting terribly’ (*Iliad* 15,687;15,732).

j) The iteratives in *SK* are not augmented,<sup>53</sup> because they describe long-lasting or repeated actions in the past, or single actions that are repeated by different and undefined characters.

Table 13: The *sk* preterites and the augment

Forms	Unaugmented	Augmented
<i>SK</i>	307	5
<i>phásko:</i>	4	13

In this table, the verb *phásko:* ‘I speak’ was included as a separate category because although this verb was originally the iterative of *phe:mí*, it did not have this meaning in Homer anymore and later created an entire paradigm, contrary to the other *SK* forms.

The absence of the augment is particularly visible in speech introductions with this suffix:<sup>54</sup> they refer to a single speech that was repeated by many different but unspecified characters (the suitors, the Greek or Trojan soldiers, Odysseus’s men,...).<sup>55</sup> As they all had an indefinite subject *tis* ‘someone’ and were constructed without addressee, they were less

<sup>52</sup> For *epeí* see Bakker (2005: 125 f.).

<sup>53</sup> Buttmann (1830: 382), Grashof (1852: 14), Monro (1891: 62), Smyth (1894: 464), Kühner-Blass (1892: 81), Drewitt (1912a: 44), Mohrmann (1933: 90), Chantraine (1948: 481 f.), Bakker (2005: 127), Pagniello (2007). Poehlmann (1858: 10) pointed out that this had been observed already by the *Etymologicum Magnum*.

<sup>54</sup> For a list of speech introductions and conclusions with *sk* verbs, see Fingerle (1939: 285-294) and Schneider (1995: 13 f.).

<sup>55</sup> Pagniello (2007).

clearly linked with the present situation or with the audience, and as a consequence, the verbal forms were not augmented. An example is:

- (33) ὧδε δέ τις εἶπεσκεν ἰδὼν ἐς πλησίον ἄλλον  
 hó:de dé =tis (w)eípesken idò:n es ple:síon állon  
 so someone.NOM he spoke often.AOR seeing.AOR to next.ACC SG other.ACC SG  
 ‘So then one spoke looking at his neighbour’ (*Iliad* 2,271).

## 5 Conclusion

This article has demonstrated that the presence and absence of the augment were not primarily the result of poetic freedom, but could be explained by morphometric, syntactic and semantic rules and constraints. The augment is used to stress new information, to link a past action with the present or audience and indicates a contrast between characters in the audience or real world. This is confirmed by the speech introductions and conclusions. The verbs in speech conclusions are augmented when they describe a speech that influenced a large group or a speech that caused an immediate reaction by the addressee, or when they describe how the speaking occurred (in most cases this is done by adding a participle to the conclusion). Speech introduction verbs are augmented when they are constructed with an addressee; when the speaking involves no interaction- i.e. in a soliloquy, when there is no addressee or when a group of undefined characters is speaking- the augment is absent, because those speeches do not involve interaction with the audience. As the Homeric language was an artificial language without a prescriptive grammar and with influences from everyday speech, the rules and constraints were never absolute. In later Greek prose, the augment became mandatory, whereas later poets (such as the Alexandrinians and those in the Imperial Age) interpreted the coexistence of augmented and non-augmented forms as inherent to poetry, and used the augment more randomly, but this needs to be investigated in more detail.

## Literature

- Avery, John. 1885. The Unaugmented Verb Forms of the Rig and Atharva Vedas. *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 11. 326-365.
- Bakker, Egbert. 1991. Foregrounding and indirect discourse: Temporal subclauses in a Herodotean short story. *Journal of Pragmatics* 16. 225-247.
- Bakker, Egbert. 1993a. Discourse and Performance in Homeric Poetry. *Classical Antiquity* 16. 1-29.
- Bakker, Egbert. 1993b. Activation and Preservation: The Interdependence of Textual Performance in an Oral Tradition. *Oral Tradition* 8. 5-20.
- Bakker, Egbert. 1997a. The Study of Homeric Discourse. In: Morris, Ian/ Powell, Brian (eds.), *A New Companion to Homer*, 283-304. Leiden: Brill.
- Bakker, Egbert. 1997b. *Poetry in Speech: Orality and Homeric Discourse*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.
- Bakker, Egbert. 1999a. Pointing to the Past: Verbal Augment and Temporal Deixis in Homer. In: Kazazis, John/ Rengakos, Antonios (eds.), *Euphrosyne. Studies in Ancient Epic and its Legacy in Honor of Dimitris N. Maronitis*, 50-65. Stuttgart: Steiner.
- Bakker, Egbert 1999b. Homeric ΟΥΤΟΣ and the Poetics of Deixis. *Classical Philology* 94. 1-19.
- Bakker, Egbert 2005. *Pointing at the past: from formula to performance in Homeric poetics*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Bally, Charles. 1947. *Manuel d'accentuation grecque*. Bern: Francke.

- Basset, Louis. 1989. L'augment et la distinction discours/récit dans l'Iliade et l'Odyssée. In: Casevitz, Michel (ed.), *Études homériques: Séminaire de recherche*, 9-16. Lyon: Travaux de la Maison de l'Orient.
- Bauer, Anna. 2011. Verberststellung im Hethitischen. In: Krisch, Thomas/ Lindner, Thomas (eds.), *Indogermanistik und Linguistik im Dialog*, 39-48. Wiesbaden: Reichelt.
- Beck, Wilhelm. 1919. *De augmenti apud Homerum usu*. Giessen: Noske.
- Beckwith, Miles. 1994. Greek ἤϊρον, Laryngeal Loss and the Reduplicated Aorist. *Glotta* 72. 24-30.
- Beckwith, Miles. 1996. *The Greek Reduplicated Aorist*. PhD Thesis, Yale University.
- Beckwith, Miles. 1999. Homeric (ἐκ)λέλαθον. *Kuhns Zeitschrift für vergleichende Sprachforschung* 112. 78-85.
- Beekes, Robert. 1995. *Comparative Indo-European Linguistics*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Beekes, Robert. 2010. *Greek Etymological Dictionary*. Leiden: Brill.
- Bekker, Immanuel. 1863. *Homerische Blätter*. Beilage zu dessen *Carmina Homerica*. Bonn: Marcus.
- Bekker, Immanuel. 1872. *Homerische Blätter*. Zweiter Band. Beilage zu dessen *Carmina Homerica*. Bonn: Marcus.
- Bendahman, Jadwiga. 1991. *Der reduplizierte Aorist in den indogermanischen Sprachen*. PhD Thesis, University of Freiburg.
- Bergaigne, Abel. 1877. *Essai sur la construction grammaticale considérée dans son développement historique*. Paris : Klincksieck.
- Bergaigne, Abel. 1879. Essai sur la construction grammaticale. *Mémoires de la Société Linguistique de Paris* 3. 1-51.
- Blumenthal, H. J. 1974. Some Homeric Evidence for the History of the Augment. *Indogermanische Forschungen* 79. 67-77.
- Bopp, Franz. 1842. *Vergleichende Grammatik des Sanskrit, Zend, Griechischen, Lateinischen*. Vierte Abteilung. Berlin: Dümmler.
- Bottin, Luigi. 1969. Studio dell'aumento in Omero. *Studi Micenei ed Egeo-Anatolici* 10. 69-145.
- Bréal, Michel. 1900. Les commencements du verbe. *Mémoires de la Société Linguistique de Paris* 11. 268-284.
- Brugmann, Karl. 1900. *Griechische Grammatik*. München: Beck.
- Brugmann, Karl. 1904. *Kurze vergleichende Grammatik der indogermanischen Sprachen*. Berlin: de Gruyter.
- Brugmann, Karl. 1916. *Grundriß der vergleichenden Grammatik der indogermanischen Sprachen*. Band II.3. Straßburg: Trübner.
- Buttmann, Philip. 1830. *Ausführliche griechische Sprachlehre*. Erster Band. Berlin: Dümmler.
- Buttmann, Philip. 1839. *Ausführliche griechische Sprachlehre*. Zweiter Band. Berlin: Dümmler.
- Buttmann, Philip. 1854. *Griechische Grammatik*. Berlin: Dümmler.
- Caland, Willem. 1890. Beiträge zur kenntnis des avesta. *Kuhns Zeitschrift für vergleichende Sprachforschung* 30. 534-547.
- Chantraine, Pierre. 1948. *Grammaire homérique*. Paris: Klincksieck.
- Chantraine, Pierre. 1953. *Grammaire homérique. Tome II : Syntaxe*. Paris: Klincksieck.
- Chantraine, Pierre. 1964. *Morphologie historique du grec*. Paris: Klincksieck.
- Chantraine, Pierre. 1968-1974. *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue grecque. Histoire des mots*. Paris: Klincksieck.
- Clackson, James. 2007. *Indo-European Linguistics: An Introduction*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- De Jong, Irene. 2012. Double deixis in Homeric speech: on the interpretation of ODE and OUTOS. In: Meier-Brügger, Michael (ed.), *Homer durch ein grosses Lexikon gedeutet*, 63-83. Berlin: de Gruyter.
- De Lamberterie, Charles. 2007. L'augment dans le texte arménien de l'Évangile. *Révue des Études arméniennes* 30. 31-57.
- Delbrück, Berthold. 1871. *Syntaktische Forschungen I. Der Gebrauch des Conjunctivs und Optativs im Sanskrit und Griechischen*. Halle: Verlag der Buchhandlung des Waisenhauses.
- Delbrück, Berthold. 1876. *Syntaktische Forschungen II. Altindische Tempuslehre*. Halle: Verlag der Buchhandlung des Waisenhauses.
- Delbrück, Berthold. 1878. *Syntaktische Forschungen III. Die Altindische Wortfolge aus der Çatapathabrāhmaṇa*. Halle: Verlag der Buchhandlung des Waisenhauses.
- Delbrück, Berthold. 1879. *Syntaktische Forschungen IV. Die Grundlagen der griechischen Syntax*. Halle: Verlag der Buchhandlung des Waisenhauses.
- Delbrück, Berthold. 1888. *Syntaktische Forschungen V. Altindische Syntax*. Halle: Verlag der Buchhandlung des Waisenhauses.
- Delbrück, Berthold. 1893. *Vergleichende Syntax der indogermanischen Sprachen*. I. Straßburg: Trübner.
- Delbrück, Berthold. 1897. *Vergleichende Syntax der indogermanischen Sprachen*. II. Straßburg: Trübner.
- Delbrück, Berthold. 1900. *Vergleichende Syntax der indogermanischen Sprachen*. III. Straßburg: Trübner.
- Denniston, J. 1959. *The Greek Particles*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Dottin, Georges. 1894. *L'augment des verbes composés dans l'Iliade et l'Odyssée*. Rennes: Oberthür.
- Dressler, Wolfgang. 1969. Eine textsyntaktische Regel der idg. Wortstellung. *Kuhns Zeitschrift für vergleichende Sprachforschung* 83. 1-25.
- Dressler, Wolfgang. 1972. Über die Rekonstruktion der indogermanischen Syntax. *Kuhns Zeitschrift für vergleichende Sprachforschung* 85. 5-22.
- Drewitt, J. 1912a. The Augment in Homer. *Classical Quarterly* 6. 44-59.
- Drewitt, J. 1912b. The Augment in Homer (continued). *Classical Quarterly* 6. 104-120.
- Drewitt, J. 1913. A Note on The Augment. *Classical Philology* 8. 349-353.
- Fingerle, Anton. 1939. *Typik der homerischen Reden*. PhD Thesis, University of Munich.
- Fortson, Benjamin. 2010. *Indo-European language and culture: an introduction*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Fournier, H. 1946. *Les verbes 'dire' en grec ancien*. Paris : Klincksieck.
- Frisk, Hjalmar. 1960. *Griechisches Etymologisches Wörterbuch*. 1: A-Ko. Heidelberg: Winter.
- Frisk, Hjalmar. 1970. *Griechisches Etymologisches Wörterbuch*. Teil 2. Heidelberg: Winter.
- Fritz, Matthias. 2010. *Indogermanische Syntax*. In: Meier-Brügger, Michael (ed.), *Indogermanische Sprachwissenschaft*, 374-412. Berlin: de Gruyter.
- Fritz, Matthias. 2011. *Der Dual im Indogermanischen*. Heidelberg: Winter.
- Führer, Rudolph. 1967. *Formproblemuntersuchungen zu den Reden in der frühgriechischen Lyrik*. München: Beck.
- García Ramón, José. 2012. TAM, Augment and Evidentiality in Indo-European. Handout from Workshop *Grammatische und lexikalische Strukturen im Wandel* held in Cologne, March 21st -23rd 2012.
- Grashof, Carl. 1852. *Abhandlung zur Kritik des Homerischen Textes in Bezug auf die Abwerfung des Augments*. Düsseldorf: Voss.
- Grimm, J. 1962. Die Partikel ἄρα im frühen griechischen Epos. *Glotta* 40. 3-41.

- Hackstein, Olav. 2010. The Greek of Epic. In: Bakker, Egbert (ed.), *A Companion to the Ancient Greek Language*, 401-423. Malden, MA: Blackwell.
- Hackstein, Olav. 2011a. Homerische Metrik. In: Rengakos, Antonios/ Zimmermann, Bernd (eds.), *Homer Handbuch: Leben – Werk – Wirkung*, 26-32. Stuttgart: Steiner.
- Hackstein, Olav. 2011b. Der sprachliche Hintergrund. In: Rengakos, Antonios/ Zimmermann, Bernd (eds.), *Homer Handbuch: Leben – Werk – Wirkung*, 32-45. Stuttgart: Steiner.
- Hajnal, Ivo. 2003a. *Troja aus sprachwissenschaftlicher Sicht. Die Struktur einer Argumentation*. Innsbruck: Innsbrucker Beiträge zur Sprachwissenschaft.
- Hajnal, Ivo. 2003b. Der epische Hexameter im Rahmen der Homer-Troia Debatte. In: Ulf, Christof (ed.), *Der neue Streit um Troja. Eine Bilanz*, 217-231. München: Beck.
- Hale, Mark. 1987. Notes on Wackernagel's Law in the language of the Rig Veda. In: Watkins, Calvert (ed.), *Studies in Memory of Warren Cowgill (1929-1985)*, 38-50. Berlin: de Gruyter.
- Hartung, Johann. 1832. *Lehre von den Partikeln der griechischen Sprache. I*. Erlangen: Palm und Enke.
- Hartung, Johann. 1833. *Lehre von den Partikeln der griechischen Sprache. II*. Erlangen: Palm und Enke.
- Haskell, Willabe. 1885. On the Accentuation of the Vocative Case in the Rig and Atharva Vedas. *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 11. 57-66.
- Hoeningwald, Henri. 1964. Mycenaean Augments and the Language of Poetry. In: Bennett, Emmett (ed.), *Mycenaean Studies*, 179-182. Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin Press.
- Hoffmann, Karl. 1957. Zur vedischen Verbalflexion. *Münchener Studien zur Sprachwissenschaft* 2. 121-137.
- Hoffmann, Karl. 1967. *Der Injunktiv im Veda*. Heidelberg: Winter.
- Hoffmann, Karl. 1970. Das Kategoriensystem des indogermanischen Verbums. *Münchener Studien zur Sprachwissenschaft* 28. 19-41.
- Hooker, John. 1980. *Linear B. An Introduction*. Bristol: Bristol Classical Press.
- Janko, Richard. 1982. *Homer; Hesiod and the Hymns: diachronic development in epic diction*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Janko, Richard. 1992. *The Iliad: a commentary. Volume 13-16*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Kelly, Adrian. 2007. *A Referential Commentary and Lexicon to the Iliad*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Kiparsky, Paul. 1968. Tense and Mood in Indo-European Syntax. *Foundations of Language* 4. 30-57.
- Kiparsky, Paul. 2005. The Vedic Injunctive: Historical and Synchronic Implications. <http://www.stanford.edu/~kiparsky/Papers/injunctive.article.pdf> [accessed 2013-12-17].
- Kirk, Geoffrey. 1985. *The Iliad: A Commentary. Books 1-4*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Kirk, Geoffrey. 1990. *The Iliad: A Commentary. Books 5-8*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Klein, Jared. 1992. Some Indo-European Systems of Conjunction: RigVeda, Old Persian, Homer. *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology* 94. 1-51.
- Koch, Konrad. 1868. *De augmento apud Homerum omisso*. Braunschweig: Meyer.
- Krisch, Thomas. 1990. Das Wackernagelsche Gesetz aus heutiger Sicht. In: Rix, Helmut/ Eichner, Heiner (eds.), *Sprachwissenschaft und Philologie. Jakob Wackernagel und die Indogermanistik heute*, 64-81. Wiesbaden: Reichelt.
- Krisch, Thomas. 1997. B. Delbrücks Arbeiten zur Wortstellung aus heutiger Sicht. In: Crespo, Emilio/ García Ramón, José (eds.), *Berthold Delbrück y la sintaxis indoeuropea hoy*, 283-309. Wiesbaden: Reichelt.



- Kühner, Raphael/ Blass, Friedrich. 1890. *Griechische Grammatik. Formenlehre*. Erster Band. Hannover: Hahn.
- Kühner, Raphael/ Blass, Friedrich. 1892. *Griechische Grammatik. Formenlehre*. Zweiter Band. Hannover: Hahn.
- Kühner, Rafael/ Gerth, Bernd. 1898. *Ausführliche Grammatik der griechischen Sprache. Zweiter Theil. Satzlehre*. Erster Band. Hannover: Hahn.
- Kühner, Rafael/ Gerth, Bernd. 1904. *Ausführliche Grammatik der griechischen Sprache. Zweiter Theil. Satzlehre*. Zweiter Band. Hannover: Hahn.
- La Roche, Jacob. 1866. *Die homerische Textkritik im Alterthum nebst einem Anhang über die Homerhandschriften*. Leipzig: Teubner.
- La Roche, Jacob. 1867. *Ilias ad fidem librorum optimorum*. Leipzig: Teubner.
- La Roche, Jacob. 1869. *Homerische Untersuchungen*. Leipzig: Teubner.
- La Roche, Jacob. 1882. *Das Augment des griechischen Verbum*. Linz: Verlag des kaiserlichen Gymnasiums.
- La Roche, Jacob. 1893. *Homerische Untersuchungen*. Zweiter Theil. Leipzig: Teubner.
- Latacz, Joachim. 2000. *Homers Ilias: Gesamtkommentar*. Band I.1. Faszikel 1: Text: Gesang und Übersetzung. München: Beck.
- Leaf, Walter. 1900. *Homer: The Iliad*. I: Books I-XII. London: MacMillan.
- Leaf, Walter. 1902. *Homer: The Iliad*. II. Books XIII-XXIV. London: MacMillan.
- Lehnert, Christian. 2005. *Augmentierte und nicht-augmentierte Formen bei Homer. Eine Untersuchung der Verteilung anhand der zwei ersten Bücher der Ilias*. MA Thesis, University of Munich.
- Lehnert, Christian. 2012. Anmerkungen zum homerischen Augment. In: Melchert, Craig (ed.), *The Indo-European Verb*, 209-212. Bremen: Hempen.
- LSJ= Liddell, Henry/ Scott, Robert/ Jones, Henry/ McKenzie, Roderick. 1996. *Greek-English Lexicon*, with a revised Supplement. With the Help of Many Scholars. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Luraghi, Silvia. 1990. *Old Hittite Sentence Structure*. London: Blackwell.
- Luria, Silvio. 1974. Zu den neugefundenen pylischen Inschriften. *Parola del Passato* 15. 241-259.
- Macdonell, Arthur. 1910. *Vedic Grammar*. Straßburg: Trübner.
- Macdonell, Arthur. 1916. *A Vedic Grammar for Students*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Meier-Brügger, Michael. 1992a. *Griechische Sprachwissenschaft*. I. Berlin: de Gruyter.
- Meier-Brügger, Michael. 1992b. *Griechische Sprachwissenschaft*. II. Berlin: de Gruyter.
- Meier-Brügger, Michael. 2010. *Indogermanische Sprachwissenschaft*. Berlin: de Gruyter.
- Meillet, Antoine. 1937. *Introduction à l'étude comparative des langues indo-européennes*. Paris: Klincksieck.
- Mohrmann, Christine. 1933. *Homerische Sprachlehre*. Nijmegen: Dekker.
- Monro, David. 1891. *A Grammar of the Homeric Dialect*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Mumm, Peter-Arnold. 1995. Verbale Definitheit und der vedische Injunktiv. In: Hettrich, Heinrich/ Hock, Wolfgang (eds.), *Verba et Structurae*. Festschrift für Klaus Strunk, 169-193. Innsbruck: Innsbrucker Beiträge zur Sprachwissenschaft.
- Mumm, Peter-Arnold. 2004. Zur Funktion des homerischen Augments. In: Krisch, Thomas (ed.), *Analecta homini universali dicata*. Festschrift für Oswald Panagl, 148-158. Stuttgart: Steiner.
- Mutzbauer, Carl. 1909. *Die Grundlagen der griechischen Tempuslehre und der homerische Tempusgebrauch*. Straßburg: Trübner.
- Pagniello, Frederick. 2007. The past-iterative and the augment in Homer. *Indogermanische Forschungen* 112. 105-123.
- Platt, Arthur. 1891. The Augment in Homer. *Journal of Philology* 19. 211-237.
- Platt, Arthur. 1909. On *te* with vocatives. *Classical Review* 23. 105-106.

- Poehlmann, Heinrich. 1858. *Quomodo poetae epici augmento temporali usi sint*. Tilsit: unknown publisher.
- Probert, Philomen. 2007. *A New Short Guide to the Accentuation of Greek*. Bristol: Bristol University Press.
- Rijksbaron, Albert. 2002. *The syntax and semantics of the verb in Classical Greek*. Amsterdam: Gieben.
- Rix, Helmut. 1976. *Historische Grammatik des Griechischen. Laut- und Formenlehre*. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft.
- Rix, Helmut. 1992. *Historische Grammatik des Griechischen. Laut- und Formenlehre*. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft.
- Rosén, Haiim. 1973. Satzbau und augmentloses Tempus in Homerischen Tatsachenbericht. *Folia Linguistica* 6. 315-330.
- Ruijgh, Cornelis. 1990. La place des enclitiques dans l'ordre des mots chez Homère d'après la loi de Wackernagel. In: Rix, Helmut/ Eichner, Heiner (eds.), *Sprachwissenschaft und Philologie. Jakob Wackernagel und die Indogermanistik heute*, 213-233. Wiesbaden: Reichelt.
- Ruijgh, Cornelis. 2011. Mycenaean and Homeric Greek. In: Duhoux, Yves/ Morpurgo Davies, Anna (eds.), *A Companion to Linear B: Mycenaean Greek, Texts and their World*, 251-298. Louvain-la-Neuve: presses de l'université.
- Sánchez- Ruipérez, Martín. 1999. *Anthologie Ilias und Odyssee*. Wiesbaden: Reichelt.
- Schmidt, Moriz. 1854a. Aristarch- Homerische excursus 1: Augment. *Philologus* 9. 426-434.
- Schmidt, Moriz. 1854b. Nachträgliche bemerkungen. *Philologus* 9. 752-756.
- Schmitt, Rüdiger. 1967a. Zwei Bemerkungen zum Augment. *Kuhns Zeitschrift für vergleichende Sprachforschung* 81. 63-67.
- Schmitt, Rüdiger. 1967b. *Dichtung und Dichtersprache in indogermanischer Zeit*. Wiesbaden: Reichelt.
- Schmitt, Rüdiger. 1977. *Einführung in die griechischen Dialekte*. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft.
- Schneider, Horst. 1995. *Der anonyme Publikumscommentar in Ilias und Odyssee*. Münster: Lit.
- Schwyzler, Eduard. 1939. *Griechische Grammatik auf der Grundlage Karl Brugmanns Griechischer Grammatik*. München: Beck.
- Schwyzler, Eduard/ Debrunner, Albert. 1950. *Griechische Grammatik*. Teil II. München: Beck.
- Shewan, A. 1912. The Homeric Augment. *Classical Philology* 7. 397-411.
- Shewan, A. 1914. The Homeric Augment Again. *Classical Philology* 9. 189-191.
- Shipp, Geoffrey. 1966. *The Language of Homer*. Amsterdam: Mouton.
- Shipp, Geoffrey. 1972. *Studies in the Language of Homer*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Stadelmann, C. 1840. *Grammatisch-kritische Anmerkungen zur Ilias des Homer*. Erster Band: 1-4 Buch. Leipzig: Gebhardt.
- Strunk, Klaus. 1967. Wortstruktur und Pronomen im Altpersischen. *Kuhns Zeitschrift für vergleichende Sprachforschung* 81. 265-275.
- Strunk, Klaus. 1975. Zum Verhältnis von Wort und Satz in der Syntax des Lateinischen und Griechischen. *Gymnasium* 82. 225-239.
- Strunk, Klaus. 1987. Ergänzende Beobachtungen zu 'Wortumfang' und 'Wortform'. *Kuhns Zeitschrift für vergleichende Sprachforschung* 100. 323-338.
- Strunk, Klaus. 1994. Der Ursprung des verbalen Augments – Ein Problem Franz Bopps in heutiger Sicht. In: Sternemann, Rudolph (ed.), *Bopp-Symposium 1992 der Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin*, 270-284. Heidelberg: Winter.

- Tichy, E. 2009. *Indogermanistisches Grundwissen für Studierende sprachwissenschaftlicher Disziplinen*. Bremen: Hempten.
- Untermann, Jürgen. 1987. *Einführung in die Sprache Homers*. Heidelberg: Winter.
- Van Thiel, Helmut. 1991. *Homeri Odyssea*. Hildesheim: Olms.
- Veitch, William. 1879. *Greek Verbs. Defective and Irregular*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Verdenius, Willem. 1987. *Commentaries on Pindar I*. Leiden: Brill.
- Vilborg, Ebbe. 1960. *A Tentative Grammar of Mycenaean Greek*. Göteborg: Almqvist och Wiksell.
- Wackernagel, Jacob. 1877. Der griechische verbalaccent. *Kuhns Zeitschrift für vergleichende Sprachforschung* 23. 457-470.
- Wackernagel, Jacob. 1878. Die epische Zerdehnung. *Bezzenbergers Beiträge* 4. 259-312.
- Wackernagel, Jacob. 1888. Miszellen. *Kuhns Zeitschrift für vergleichende Sprachforschung* 29. 124-152.
- Wackernagel, Jacob. 1892. Über ein Gesetz der indogermanischen Wortstellung. *Indogermanische Forschungen* 1. 333-437.
- Wackernagel, Jacob. 1906. Wortumfang und Wortform. (=Latte, Kurt (ed.), 1951. *Jacob Wackernagel: Kleine Schriften I*, 148-185. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck).
- Wackernagel, Jacob. 1942. Indogermanische Dichtersprache. *Philologus* 95. 1-19.
- Wachter, Rudolph. 2000. Homer: Sprache. In: Latacz, Joachim. 2000 (ed.), *Homers Ilias: Gesamtkommentar. Prolegomena*, 61-107. München: Beck.
- Watkins, Calvert. 1963. Preliminaries to a Historical and Comparative Analysis of the Syntax of the Old Irish Verb. *Celtica* 6. 1-49.
- Watkins, Calvert. 1998. Proto-Indo-European: Comparison and Reconstruction. In: Giacalone Ramat, Anna/ Ramat, Paolo (eds.), *The Indo-European Languages*, 25-73. London: Routledge.
- West, Martin. 1989. An Unrecognized Injunctive Usage in Greek. *Glotta* 67. 135-138.
- West, Martin. 1998. *Homerus Ilias. Volumen I: Rhapsodiae I - XII*. Berlin: de Gruyter.
- West, Martin. 2000. *Homerus Ilias. Volumen II: Rhapsodiae XIII - XXIV*. Berlin: de Gruyter.
- Willi, Andreas. 2007. Of aspects, augments, aorists – or how to say to have killed a dragon. In: George, Coulter (ed.), *Greek and Latin from an Indo-European Perspective*, 34-48. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Wills, Jeffrey. 1993. Homeric Particle Order. *Kuhns Zeitschrift für vergleichende Sprachforschung* 106. 61-81.
- Zwolanek, Renée. 1970. *Váyav índraśca. Studien zu Anrufungsformen im Vedischen, Avestischen und Griechischen*. München: Kitzinger.

